

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 2, 1978

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE - DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

VOTE 1

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — Under the Department of Labour, you had the fire inspectors' division. Does he inspect the or make the requirements for example for nursing homes and level IV care, what regulations you need to make sure that they are safe?

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Department of Labour): — Yes, we provide the regulations for nursing homes, give the indication, you know, given in large measure by the national fire code and national building code with respect to the widths of corridors, exits, sprinkler systems, things of that nature.

Mr. Katzman: — Well, there is an old folks home being built in Saskatoon presently and I'm wondering. It's a level IV I'm told and there are no balconies and no exit windows that people could come out of. I understand on that area you are supposed to have them. Is that incorrect?

Mr. Snyder: — That is not part of the national building code Mr. Sheasby tells me, and there is no provision. The other requirements are laid out clearly for the contractor and the architects and as long as they meet those specifications there is no specification for balconies.

Mr. Katzman: — Well balconies are secondary escape from a third floor because that is the only way of coming out and if the fire was in that aisle way they would be trapped and that was the concern that I had when I inspected it on Monday morning.

Mr. Snyder: — Give us the name of the institution and we will check it out. If it's a new . . .

Mr. Katzman: — It's St. Anne's Home. It's under construction.

Mr. Snyder: — Well, certainly give us the name or you can send it over or offer it to us by one process or another and we will have the fire inspection people check it out.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Minister, I understand that there has been some shift within your department on some of the senior officers and I'm wondering if you could indicate what changes were made and why some of your most senior people were overlooked on some of the positions as the department was reorganized?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, I'm not sure. Let me look at the chart. It shows the department reorganization and several changes with the Industrial Relations Division or branch virtually the same with Occupational Health And Safety undergoing no particular change and new grouping. With respect to employee services which has been filled with Lynne Pearson, the former director of the Women's Division. Under Lynne Pearson and the Employee Service Division or Branch is Mr. Wartman who was formerly with the Administrative Services and that remains unchanged. Pensions remained unchanged. The Apprenticeship And Labour Standards . . . a competition there with Mr. Gerry Meier behind the rail, having filled that position. The Manpower Branch with

research associated directly with that. The Manpower Branch with Tony Oscienny, the incumbent there and Mr. Wartman of Administration. And of Research Division, Don Goss. I'm not sure what the member is drawing attention to particularly, that gives you sort of a broad outline of the reorganization with four people particularly reporting directly to the Deputy Minister where previously there were I think, seven. It became somewhat cumbersome and it's a reorganization and the detailing of responsibilities.

Mr. Katzman: — Well, my first question, Mr. Minister, to you was it seems like the minister approves of the recent organization of his department that he set aside a lot of senior career civil servants in his department and overlooked them for promotion. And of course with promotion goes the higher salary, to people it seemed to be indicated to be political involvements moving into your department. And I'm wondering is the minister . . .

Mr. Snyder: — Spill it out. If you're going to make charges, spill it out. Don't hide behind your desk. Tell me who they are.

Mr. Katzman: — I'd hate to see you choke on the cigar, Mr. Minister, as you get irate but let's start with the gentleman who came from Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. I believe he was the vice-president and he's now executive director of the Industrial Relations Branch. Now, I wonder if that gentleman, Ron Duncan, is known to be unbiased and known to have no involvement with any particular union or involvement that way. In other words, can it be considered that he isn't biased and so forth and also wouldn't you say by some of his past actions that he could be considered as one of those that's a political friend of the minister and the deputy minister.

Mr. Snyder: — Well, I want to tell the hon. member this. This was a job that was vacated by a person who is a very able person in Stan Williams, who came directly out of industry, who did not have, a bias on behalf of the political party that I happen to belong to. He did an excellent job with me. He was hired because of his talents because of his ability and because of the fact that he was a top notch person in terms of industrial relations. Ron Duncan was hired for exactly the same reason and I think every day he's proving himself in that capacity. I can go through the description of his work. I think I needn't justify the kind of question that's being directed to me. His record stands on its own and I think he's doing an excellent job as Director of Industrial Relations. People aren't blood tested when they join the Department of Labour to determine what their politics are. I have within the department people who are not of my political persuasion but as long as they continue to do their job then they'll continue to occupy positions of authority and continue to do a good job for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Katzman: — The minister says that the people aren't blood tested. Well, let me tell the minister, in 1975 or I'll go back even further in 1971 as a member of a union I was required to give funds to the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour through my deductions which went directly to the NDP through the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. So don't tell me that they aren't blood tested because they are.

Mr. Snyder: — This is the biggest travesty I've ever listened to. I belonged to a trade union organization which had a check-off and I had members of my particular brotherhood, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers at that time determined they did not want to make a contribution and they opted and you had the

same option, if you had the courage of your convictions. All you had to do was to opt out. There was nothing that obliged you to make any contribution of five cents a month to any political party.

Mr. Katzman: — Are you now saying that you did receive five cents from every worker in this province through the check-off as voted through a . . .

Mr. Snyder: — Certainly. If the local opts in then they do pay five cents per month and if they do decide to opt out on an individual basis . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I would like one member on his feet at a time and I would appreciate keeping the decorum of the House as close to the proper manners as we can and let's proceed with the business. Item 1 agreed?

Mr. Katzman: — Not for a while, Mr. Chairman. Are you saying then that, we are using the name, you called for names not me. Are you suggesting, are you suggesting here that this individual, when he was hired by you met all the qualifications and are you suggesting that he had no political affiliation, no involvement with your party? We can forget the political affiliation if you want because I don't think we want to get into that, but is he not in the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour's direct involvement with the NDP and the former, I believe he was either in the Attorney General's department, Mr. Brown was involved with the government before, are you suggesting that that isn't part of the reason that that gentleman is there now?

Mr. Snyder: — I would suggest that it is not the reason he is there. He is there because he does an able and a conscientious job. He is probably one of the best people that I know of in the province of Saskatchewan in terms of his skill and his dexterity in terms of industrial relations and handling delicate problems and doing the kind of job that is required as Director of Industrial Relations. I get a little peeved with the hon. member opposite who likes to brush shoulders and be friendly and invade the room about the time there is a signing of a document, when he is totally and completely unwelcome in that atmosphere. He has got more brass than a junk yard. Mr. Chairman, I say once again Ron Duncan was hired for his skills and his ability. If he happens to belong to the right political party, then that happens also to be a plus.

Mr. Katzman: — I don't dispute that he may or may not belong to that right political party, as you call it. I think the importance of the decision to use the man is will he be considered neutral when he sits in that chair or will he be considered one way or the other. The key is not if he is a member of your party or not, which you seem to indicate he is, the key is will he be considered by those that have to deal with Industrial Relations Branch as a neutral person and not one way sided.

Mr. Snyder: — Right at the present moment Mr. Duncan is involved very deeply in the construction agreement that is tentatively being negotiated and I think he is doing a 24 carat job for the Labour Relations Council of the construction industry and the building trades that are involved. I defy anybody to go to you or any other member of this House or inside or outside of this House and indicate that it isn't a genuine 24 carat job that is being done there, to the extent that the bulk of the agreements are currently in place and we have expectations that we will be able to resolve it in the way in which it appears it's not being resolved in the province of Manitoba. Maybe some of that expertise that we have here, we should lend some of it to the neighbouring province to the east of us because they are doing a pretty rotten job just one step to the east of us. I think that our people are doing an excellent job. I've never been prouder of a group than I have in the

Industrial Relations Branch at this particular point in time. I think they are all excellent people and doing the kind of a job that is expected of them by both management and the trade union groups.

Mr. Katzman: — It is interesting, the comments that the minister is making. You made one comment earlier about a Mr. Wartman. Could you indicate what position he now has in the department?

Mr. Snyder: — He is Director of Administrative Services Division in the Department of Labour. Experience, Welfare Worker's Certificate, BA in Political Science, University of Saskatchewan, administrative analyst PIMS Unit Budget Bureau, Administrative Analyst 1 with the Budget Bureau, Administrative Analyst 11 Administrative Branch, Department of Finance, Administrative Officer IV Administration Branch, Department of Finance, one year and six months in his present position. They will qualify doing an excellent job for us.

Mr. Katzman: — I understand that he was absent from the department for a while while he was taking some education which qualified him for the position he is holding. Is that correct?

Mr. Snyder: — He has had no leave of absence from the Department of Labour since his arrival.

Mr. Katzman: — Would that explain why he was paid 80, I understand he was paid 80 per cent of his salary while he was attending classes at Cornell University in the United States?

Mr. Snyder: — No he was not and he has not had a leave of absence. I just finished answering that question. He was not on educational leave since he joined the department.

Mr. Katzman: — Was he not at Cornell University in the United States taking a Labour Relations Course?

Mr. Snyder: — I will repeat it for the third time. No, he was not. How often do you have to be told? I told you three times, no, he has not been on leave of absence since he joined the Department of Labour.

Mr. Katzman: — One other question. I noticed in your reorganization, you suggested some areas there wasn't much done in. I realize Mr. Robert Sass is considered one of the top experts in the country on occupational health. I am just wondering, within your department, in other areas, and I know Mr. Sass is an American citizen and I do not hold that against him. He is excellent in his position, but I am wondering how many more people from outside of Canada have come in, that have taken positions where Canadians who are qualified, I understand, within your own department have been passed over.

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Sass is a citizen of Canada, not a citizen of the United States.

Mr. Katzman: — I understand that there is a Barb Zimmer. Is that correct?

Mr. Snyder: — I do not know what her nationality, creed, colour or religion is, except that she is doing an excellent job and was hired on the basis of her qualifications. As far

as I know she is a landed immigrant.

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Chairman, the minister made a comment, about the check-off from the various unions in the province of Saskatchewan that goes to the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and subsequently is donated to the NDP in the name of the individual members. He suggested during his comments that the local union had the opportunity to opt out of this checkoff, this political checkoff, and I would like to ask the minister how many union locals he knows of in the province of Saskatchewan that have in fact opted out of this particular checkoff that was donated to one particular party.

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Chairman, I am unable to find any reference to this in the blue book. I find nothing in my estimates that has anything remotely associated or connected with this. I have no idea how many have opted in. I do not know how many have opted out, nor is it a matter of great concern to me. I do not believe it to be a part of the Estimates of the Department of Labour. Furthermore, you are wrong in your assumption first that the assessment made delivered up to the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour which in turn disburses those funds, that's five cents a month per member which is 60 cents a year. As a matter of fact, that is not the way it happens. Each local makes its determination whether it will opt in or not and remits its money to the party organization if it is so inclined and each individual member has the option of opting out as a number of members did in my own organization quite a number of years ago. Many of them still contribute on their own volition.

Mr. Collver: — Well, Mr. Chairman, since the minister has volunteered this kind of information to the Assembly, I think it is quite incumbent upon us to follow up on this information, whether it is in the estimates of the blue book or not and I would like to further question the minister by asking him, is he trying to suggest to this Assembly that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour makes no donation to the NDP?

Mr. Snyder: — I want you to make a judgment, Mr. Chairman, if this has any part to do with the estimates that are before us before I attempt to respond.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I rule that I cannot see that this is relevant to Item 1 and I will go on to the next question there, please.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I gather there are no next questioners so . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Well, is your question a follow-up on this? If it is a new question I will acknowledge it.

Mr. Collver: — Well, Mr. Chairman, your judgment as to whether or not the contribution by a labour organization to a particular political party in the light of the increasing influence of that particular labour organization, the attention to which was drawn by the member for Rosthern to this Assembly on the staffing of the Department of Labour, I think is significant and is particularly material. The point is that we are attempting to establish that the government of the province of Saskatchewan, through the Department of Labour, is not perceived by the people of the province of Saskatchewan as an independent kind of organization. They are not perceived by the people of Saskatchewan as standing up for the rights of individuals and are acting fairly in terms of any disputes that arise. In attempting to do so, surely it is incumbent upon us to draw to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan and to the minister and to request of the minister that he go on in the statements that he has already made, about

opting in and opting out in terms of union donations to a particular party. When I say that, I do not mean individual union members. These are not individuals at all. These are trade unions. When an organization makes donations to a particular party . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I made my ruling and the member cannot debate my ruling. Next question.

Mr. Collver: — Could you tell me, Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I made my ruling. I made my ruling and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order! If you are not willing to accept my ruling and this applies to any member, you have an alternative to . . . you can challenge my chair.

Mr. Collver: — I'm not talking about challenging your ruling at all. If I understand your ruling correctly I am not to pursue any questions of the Minister of Labour about labour union donations to the NDP. Is that correct?

Mr. Chairman: — That question is not relevant it Item 1 or to the Labour Estimates under review here. If you have a new question I'll acknowledge it. Otherwise . . .

Mr. Collver: — I expect to pursue questions about trade union donations to a particular political party under the Department of Labour Estimates.

Mr. Chairman: — Order! You heard my ruling, the hon. member for Nipawin. I take him to be an hon. member and an intelligent member. Well, then, I've made my ruling and if he wants to challenge the ruling O.K., otherwise I am going on to the next questioner.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Chairman, I think I have the right to correct a statement made by the minister which was incorrect in this House. When I earlier stated that in 1971 when I was involved with the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour that our union was required to make the adjustment and he said we had the right to opt out as individuals, I would correct his statement by saying that as an individual within a local union you did not have that right. You had to have the union vote either one way or the other. No individual to my knowledge at the meeting that was held in Davidson was given that right to opt out. So I would like to correct that statement made by the minister.

Mr. J.L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the other day I listened to some of the attack that was taken on in this House against Occupational Health and Safety. I would like to say to the minister and I would like to pose a question after that, that myself going into an international union happened to be under the scope of the federal legislation in so far as Occupational Health and Safety is concerned, and those people who are with me in the organization I belong to, an international union, are very, very concerned with the lack of activity on the part of the federal Occupational Health and Safety. They have requested on numerous occasions that they become involved and also under the jurisdiction of the provincial Occupational Health and Safety. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, and a question to the minister, whether or not, in fact, there has been any recent communications between international unions that are covered under the federal jurisdiction as being covered under the provincial Occupational Health and Safety? I might just spell that out very, very clearly. The railway union that I belong to has made that representation both to the federal jurisdiction and also to the provincial jurisdiction asking that we be covered under an act that has some teeth in that particular act.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please! I would like to draw to the member's attention from Moose Jaw North, I believe it is, that there is a subvote here, I think, that will cover that area and I would ask you to try and adhere to these items and subvotes as closely as possible and I think we can certainly expedite things much greater and of more benefits to all of us.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, in his reorganization in dropping from seven qualified civil servants to four, reorganizing so that the four senior civil servants report directly to the deputy minister, how many of the four people who report directly to the deputy minister come from the trade union movement?

Mr. Snyder: — Well of the four who report directly to the minister, the one that was mentioned initially, Ron Duncan comes out of Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers, a Mr. Sass had, prior to his being a professor at the Regina campus, University of Saskatchewan, was also a member of a trade union organization during his earlier years - two of the four.

Mr. Collver: — The other two, what was their background again? They did not come from the trade union movement? Did they come from industry in management positions?

Mr. Snyder: — Lynne Pearson, director of employment services, has a Master of Arts, community development, University of Alberta, Bachelor of Journalism, Carleton University, University of Saskatchewan, BC co-ordinator of the International Women's Year, secretariat with the federal Privy Council one year, co-ordinator of community development, two years, program at Algonquin College, teaching master, general arts and science, Algonquin College one year, community recreation specialists, city of Ottawa, 2 ½ years. That's Lynne Pearson, one of the people who reports directly to the deputy minister. Craig Dotson, Bachelor Arts in History, in Arizona; Ph.D. History Queen's University, MPA Public Administration, Queen's University, 1968-75 Department of History, Queen's University, Research Assistant; 1974 Queen's University Task Force on Graduate Studies and Research, Research Associate 1975-76, Administrative Analyst Budget Bureau, Department of Finance, June 1976 to February 1978, Department of Finance, Budget Bureau Senior Analyst relating to the Department of Labour, Continuing Education, Education and Culture and Youth and Provincial Library.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, as I understand it then there was one directly from the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and three from what you might refer to, in a broad, general categorization, as either academic backgrounds or, if you like, government boards and commissioned type positions. So that of the four senior officials reporting to the deputy minister none were in positions of management in the private sector at all. Are there any officials of the Department of Labour, in your department, whose background - and I am talking about senior officials now - perhaps say the next echelon down from the four, are there any of them at all that had any kind of management expertise, or any kind of management background in the private sector?

Mr. Chairman: — Might I have the permission of the Assembly here for the member for Regina Centre to introduce some guests in the Chamber, please.

WELCOMES TO GUESTS

Mr. E.B. Shillington (Regina Centre): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sure all members will want to join me in welcoming to you and through you, to the committee, approximately 20 members of the Beta Sigma Phi Alpha Chapter from Regina. I understand they are going to be with us for about a half an hour and then I am going to have the pleasure of meeting with them in the rotunda. I hope they find these proceedings enlightening, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Committee continues.

Mr. Snyder: — Cliff Dark, formerly had some direct association, I am told, in management circles. Mansell Crozier came out of the private railway industry; Stan Williams who was formerly, he is not with us now, he is retired, but Stan Williams was personnel director with IMC; Mr. Sass, prior to coming to the University of Saskatchewan was professor of administration there and adviser on management and personnel matters and things of that nature.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the minister didn't quite answer the question. What I asked for was, the names I am not concerned with, you have given me the names of the four. One of them comes directly from the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and the other three apparently come from either academic backgrounds or serving with various boards and agencies of government, or serving in the government of Saskatchewan in other departments in some capacity in the last three or four years.

My question to the minister was, have any of the next echelon down, the senior four certainly don't come from the private sector in terms of any management positions, have any from the next echelon down and if so could you just give me the title of their position. I don't care about the names and just briefly what capacity they had in the private sector, perhaps, the last one. Don't go through their entire history, but the last private sector job that they had. Preferably members that are still with the department. Stan Williams, we understand, has retired so I meant under the reorganization, not the old organization, the reorganization.

Mr. Snyder: — The superintendent of pensions is one that could be referred to out of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe he was a dispatcher with the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is a step in between, he came from Mercers. He went directly from the railway industry to Mercers and there to the superintendent of pensions. He was seven years with the Canadian Pacific Railway, one year with Canada Life as a pension representative, three years with William M. Mercer, pension consultant and administrator and has been 12 years in his present position.

In connection with the suggestion earlier of the passing over of career civil servants, Mansell Crozier, I expect would be one that you would be referring to. He is still in his present position. Cliff Dark who might have been another that you are referring to is now serving in the position of special assistant to the deputy minister.

Mr. Collver: — So what the minister has said is that of the people who are involved in the senior levels of his Department of Labour, charged with the responsibility to ensure labour management harmony in the province of Saskatchewan, charged with the responsibility to ensure that the democratic procedures occur and are developed and

are encouraged to develop at the local level in the trade union movement, has at its disposal one person who formerly had some experience in the private sector and that was as a pension representative with a life insurance company and with a William Mercer Actuary. I understand they are actuarial people who act as pension consultants. That's, I understand the answer of the minister to the question. I would like to go on to my next question. That's what he has told me so far on the senior positions.

My next question to you then, Mr. Minister, is how many years combined service with the Government of Saskatchewan have the four senior members of the Department of Labour?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, my people are attempting to put that together. I should respond also that the special assistant to the deputy minister, Mr. Dark, from 1947 to 1948 was a self-employed person, a food store owner in Central Butte, hardware store manager in Moose Jaw, display advertising salesman for Moose Jaw Times Herald, self-employed Labour Standards Officer, Director of the Labour Standards Branch, Executive Director of the Labour Service Division and worked for a period of time from October something in excess of two years from October 1975 with the Boychuck Board, the Public Sector Prices and Compensation Board also.

Mr. Collver: — While your members are doing that would the minister suggest that a special assistant to the deputy minister is what he would refer to as a senior line position?

Mr. Snyder: — Yes I would.

Mr. Collver: — What precisely is the line function of the special assistant to the deputy minister?

Mr. Snyder: — It is by all means a senior staff position and as acting deputy minister in the absence of the deputy minister and performs those services as assigned to him by the deputy.

Mr. Collver: — Are you suggesting that he is second in charge of the department under the deputy minister, in other words he would be in charge of the level of four or the 'gang of four' or whatever you want to call it, who are the group directly reporting to the minister. Do they report through the special assistant to the minister or do they report directly to the deputy minister?

Mr. Snyder: — They report directly to the deputy minister but in the absence of the deputy minister, Mr. Dark acts as deputy in the absence of the Deputy Minister.

Mr. Collver: — A special assistant to the deputy minister, then in the normal course of events, has no line function but when the deputy minister steps out on a trip, this person comes in and is in charge of the four line people in the department, is that correct?

Mr. Snyder: — Yes, that's right.

Mr. Collver: — Would the minister not agree that that is a particularly unusual way to organize a department for reasonable sort of efficiency in administrative excellence. Would the minister not agree that when if there is to be an assistant deputy minister . . .

well, I'm trying to kill time until he gives me the answer as to how many of the four people, how many years of experience these four people have. That's a reasonable question to ask. I'm just waiting for the answer on it and so I'd thought I would go on to find out about this unusual arrangement where a special assistant steps in in place of a deputy, and kind of very unusual from the answer from the member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Dark is working in close proximity to the deputy on a regular basis and probably has as good an overview of the department or better overview than anyone else that can act on his behalf and in the event that the deputy is absent from his office. I don't think there is anything unusual about it at all.

Mr. Collver: — Well that's a terrific suggestion, but what's the matter with the associate deputy minister? Surely an associate deputy minister is the man that should be 2 IC. Surely that's his title. Why would you allow a special assistant to move in and be second in command over and above over top of the associate deputy minister?

Mr. Snyder: — For one thing, geographic location has something to do with it. The occupational Health and Safety Branch as you might know if you consulted the directory, is located in a different part of the city on Rose Street. The bulk of the office is located at 1914 Hamilton Street downtown on Scarth Street and, for purposes of convenience and worked exceedingly well. We see no particular reason to change a system that has been functioning well and serving us appropriately.

Mr. Collver: — Well, you have a deputy minister, you have an associate deputy minister and you have a special assistant to the deputy minister. Now, none of the gang of four, none of that group, reports directly to either the associate deputy minister (he is not the boss of them) or to the special assistant (he is not the boss of them) reports directly to the deputy minister plus a special assistant who can take the deputy minister's place when he is out of town plus an associate deputy minister who presumably has no function whatsoever in that organization of things or is the associate deputy minister also able to take the place of the deputy minister when he is out of town?

Mr. Snyder: — First of all, the associate deputy minister is one of the four super G's or call them what you wish. Mr. Sass is the associate deputy minister and also the minister in charge of the Occupational Health and Safety Division. He is second in command except for practical purposes we have the special assistant to the deputy who has been performing and doing special assignments for us since he left the Boychuck Board.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, the minister flies to Toronto, the deputy minister. Who is in charge of the Department of Labour reporting to you?

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Dark, in the recent absence of the deputy minister, was the person who reported directly to me.

Mr. Collver: — So the special assistant, Mr. Dark, is over and above or in charge of Mr. Sass, I think that is what the minister is telling me. Is that correct? When the deputy minister flies to Toronto, the special assistant is in charge of the associate deputy minister. Is that correct?

Mr. Snyder: — Yes, for practical purposes and because of geography and a host of other reasons that is the way it has been working and it has been working out

exceedingly well.

Mr. Collver: — Well, that is of course open to debate as to whether the Department of Labour has been working exceedingly well. That, after all, is what these estimates are all about - to determine how well it is working. Now we are finding out that nobody is in charge of the actions of the deputy and that you have used a special assistant who, I have no doubt, is paid at a considerably lower scale than the associate deputy minister who, I have no doubt, in the scale of government hierarchy, is considered to be considerably down the hierarchy in terms of the civil service to that of the associate deputy minister of the Department of Labour. Yet now you are telling us that this special assistant has moved up the ladder quickly and is going to be in charge of everybody and his number 2 man to the Deputy Minister of Labour. When the Deputy Minister of Labour goes away and a serious problem develops, it is a special assistant to the minister who is in charge, not the associate deputy minister but the special assistant to the minister. That is what you described to us here and it is a most unusual arrangement in terms of the administration of any organization. Surely it is as important, in so far as the lower echelons of the bureaucracy are concerned, to know who the boss is, to know where the buck stops, and to know who is supposed to perform certain functions and make certain decisions. It is just as important for efficient operation as it is higher up the ladder for the next level.

Now, I am sure the minister has had lots of time to let us know the combined total years of service of the 'group of four' who are now in charge of the Department of Labour with the Government of Saskatchewan. I am sure he will be happy to provide us with that information.

Mr. Snyder: — Yes, the combined years of service, discounting previous service with the government elsewhere, with the Department of Labour there is a combined total of the four of 12 years.

Mr. Collver: — Now you are telling us and telling this Assembly today that the average number of years of service of the senior echelons of the Department of Labour in three years, the average. In the minister's dissertations before the trade union movement, and when he was a member and a leader and an active leader in the trades union movement, one of the keys, one of the keys that the trade union movement attempted to achieve in its negotiations with every organization and I am sure, I am sure that the minister is acting as the head of a trade union in negotiating with management insisted on promotion based on seniority, promotion based on seniority. But does the minister in the Department of Labour live up to his own standards? Does he examine the qualifications of those who are there in the Department of Labour, the long standing employees and career civil servants in the Department of Labour? The answer, Mr. Chairman, is no. He doesn't turn to the most senior member with the best qualifications and say the promotion is yours if you want it. He brings them in from outside: — Manitoba, British Columbia, the United States of America; you name it, you name it and that's where the minister brings them in from . . . (interjection) . . . Now, Mr. Chairman, they talk about racism. I didn't know that the people of Manitoba were a different race than the people of Saskatchewan but the member for Moose Jaw North may have better information than most of us.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Labour has achieved precisely what the organizations that he used to represent, that the Department of Labour is supposed to stand up for - he and his own department have failed to live up to that criterion and that is when there is a qualified employee available for a promotion with seniority in the

department, the minister doesn't go out - Mr. Chairman, this just didn't happen once because once one could overlook; this didn't just happen twice; this is the total reorganization of the Department of Labour which happened within the last six months, a total reorganization in which the power is taken in the hands of four people directly reporting to the Minister of Labour - when the long time career civil servant, who is associate Deputy Minister of Labour, is shunted off to the side and a special assistant to the Deputy Minister of Labour is shunted in above his category, above his category and is spotted in . . . Oh yes, it's serious, Mr. Attorney General; you are darn right, it's dead serious.

I defy the Attorney General to go around and talk with any degree of sincerity to the civil servants of this province who make it their career and expect to get any support from them in the next provincial election because you'll find it's nonexistent. The whole purpose, the whole purpose behind this government has been to ignore career civil servants and spot in these acts that they bring in from outside because they have a particular political view. An average of three years, Mr. Chairman, three years with the Department of Labour says the minister, when he has got people and qualified people in the Department of Labour with 10 years and 15 years and 20 years service that he passed over to bring in these people who now have an average of three years.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with that. I am sick of what this government is doing to the civil service in Saskatchewan. I am sick about the fact that the people of this province have watched the deterioration in the last five years in the morale of career civil servants in this province, as a direct result of the kinds of machinations performed by the Minister of Labour in his recent reorganization. People, who have worked for the Government of Saskatchewan for years, looking for the promotions and the jobs that should be theirs, that would give them heart, that would give them hope that there was a future for them in the department have had to watch department after department after department bring in these people with no experience, no criteria whatsoever and their morale has gone down, down, down. I ask the Minister of Labour, who wasn't directly involved, wasn't directly involved in the negotiations with the SGEA but I am sure who was made aware of the attitude of the leaders of the SGEA in the recent negotiations with the Government of Saskatchewan and the major issue, Mr. Chairman, the major issue in those negotiations was the morale of the civil servants. Go talk to the career civil

servant today, Mr. Attorney General, working with the government of Saskatchewan. Well, the only way they talk to them, Mr. Chairman, they say we do, the only way they talk to them is through these people with two, three and four years experience with the government. That's how they get to them. They're listening to the wrong people. They're not listening to the people who devoted their lives to the Saskatchewan Civil Service. And, Mr. Chairman, I defy the minister to say that he doesn't have qualified people in his department with years of service, more than an average of three, that could have filled these positions.

Mr. Snyder: — This to me represents a pretty feeble attempt on behalf of the member for Nipawin to present himself as a saviour of the civil service of the province of Saskatchewan. I wonder, you know anytime you see the member for Nipawin making these loud noises, it's pretty apparent that he's attempting to obscure something else. You just have to look at Manitoba and see the morale in the province of Manitoba that is at the ebb that has never been seen before in that province. That's why we see the member for Nipawin taking the position here apparently as the defender of the downtrodden civil servants in the province of Saskatchewan. Have a look at what's happening in the province of Manitoba. Somehow this member is attempting to indicate to us that the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association is issuing warnings to us. I'll tell you what the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association is doing. They're looking very closely at the machinations of Mr. Sterling Lyon to the east of us here and have a pretty good impression of what would happen. God forbid if this champion of management associates opposite ever decided what he would do being in a position of authority.

Mr. Chairman, we have in the department good and dedicated civil servants. I'm proud of all of them. I'm proud of all of the people that I surrounded myself with over the past year . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — . . . they're good and dedicated people; a number of them have been offered positions in the super chief positions, if you like and have preferred to stay where they were.

An Hon. Member: — Really?

Mr. Snyder: — Yes, yes really. In the meantime, I think we have in our camp, Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order, please.

Mr. Snyder: — We have in the department, I believe, Mr. Chairman, a blend of youthful exuberance and experience and responsibility. I think we have a good blend of all of those qualities that make for what I believe to be the best Department of Labour that has been around since the department came into existence in 1944 as a full fledged Department of Labour. I make no apologies for the choices that have been made. I certainly want to take this opportunity to tell you right now that I am exceedingly proud of all of the people I have. Obviously all of them can't fit into the four who report directly to the deputy minister. I think that is an obvious set of circumstances that someone with a vast experience in Management Associates, however excellent that may or may not have been, should be able to acknowledge that fact.

Mr. Collver: — That was certainly a beautiful statement. Now we are going to get some magic words. The NDP has some magic words. Whenever somebody criticizes the government of Saskatchewan they use the following magic words: — Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta. Those are three magic words. Then the next magic words they use are: — Management Associates, Buildall and Switzerland. Those are the next three magic words. And every time, it doesn't matter what day it is, Mr. Chairman; it doesn't matter what topic we're discussing; it doesn't matter what bill you have got here or what item of estimates you are talking about; it makes no difference, these are the magic words of the minister - magic words.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact is this. In the province of Saskatchewan today the so-called youthful exuberance that the minister refers to, that is the combination - the youthful exuberance is in charge; they're the bosses. Right? And the so-called years of experience and years of wisdom, they're the employees. Now in this mix, Mr. Chairman, in this mix that the minister talks about in terms of youthful exuberance and years of experience, the mix is that the ones who haven't been around very long . . . I don't drink, Mr. Member for Saskatoon but I know that there are many, many across the way who do. I don't criticize them for drinking and I hope he won't criticize me for not drinking.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is this, the so-called combination of youthful exuberance and wisdom just isn't there. The experience level of the Department of Labour has been allowed to pass by the boards. The long time people have been passed over and the young in terms of years of experience with the Department of Labour that is, perhaps not young in years but young in terms of years with the department, they come up and they get to be the bosses - the super chiefs. I think that is what the minister referred to them as - super chiefs. That is his description for that group of four that have been brought in to pass by everyone who has seniority.

Mr. Chairman, the facts speak for themselves. The minister can say that he is proud of the department. I suppose it is helpful that the Minister of Labour is proud of the department that he is the minister of. I am sure that any minister who wasn't proud of his particular actions, quite simply, wouldn't want to be the minister, or shouldn't be the minister.

The present Minister of Labour, I think, is an intelligent man. I think he realizes what has happened. I think that he realizes that he has chosen this group of four to run the department through the deputy minister so that they are all-powerful over these career civil servants. To a very great extent past political experience with a particular political party may have had, may have had, some bearing on how this group of four got into their jobs. But, Mr. Chairman, the career civil servants are not going to forgive a government that bypasses time after time after time, long-standing employees of the government. They are not going to withstand it and the minister responsible for Sask Power says, absolute nonsense.

Mr. Minister, when you talk to the head of the SGEA you talk to the groups that are in that organization you will find that the last dispute was particularly due to morale, one of the very serious morale problems of the Saskatchewan Civil Service is this appointment of green people over the backs of long-standing experienced people. That speaks for itself; the civil service will decide for themselves. They will tell you by their vote in the next provincial general election.

Mr. Snyder: — A very few comments on the remarks of the hon. member for Nipawin.

I acknowledge, once again, that I think the department is a good department and a well run one, one that I am proud of and I repeat that again, because that is somewhat of a strict contrast to what we see in Manitoba. I had the good fortune to meet the new minister from Manitoba at the first conference that I attended in Manitoba, at which time she admitted that she was absolutely thunderstruck to be named as Minister of Labour in the Manitoba government, because (a) she had no interest in it; (b) she didn't like trade unions and (c) her only qualifications was that she was a manager of a hotel at one time and thought she might be qualified, perhaps, to be Minister of Tourism or something like that. But was absolutely thunderstruck, absolutely thunderstruck, that Sterling Lyon would choose her as Minister of Labour when she had no affinity for it, no like for the department and, obviously, no particular affinity for or like for the trade union movement.

Mr. Katzman: — I would like to make one comment here.

It seems interesting as we noticed that there is 12 years of seniority involved in this group of four. It is interesting to notice that many unions, there are many grievances fought today on that exact situation on long-time, long service individuals being passed over. I realize these are out-of-scope and that is the real argument that you are going to give me, but I think that the minister should be considering these long-time civil servants and I think that he deserves to have his hands rapped for that.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2, 3, and 4 agreed.

Item 5

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Chairman, I believe under this item you have the mediators for disputes and so forth, is that correct? I understand you only have two of them who are active in the field, if that is correct, and are you considering the addition of any in this new budget?

Mr. Snyder: — No, at the present time Mr. Walter, Mr. King and the director of Industrial Relations, Mr. Ron Duncan and, on occasion particularly in recent times during the construction dispute, the deputy minister has also served in that capacity on numerous occasions.

Mr. Katzman: — I assume then all the 10 others that you didn't refer to here are support staff and research staff, is that correct?

Mr. Snyder: — Professional staff 8, clerical staff 5, permanent positions 13: — 5 in scope, 1 out-of-scope, 7 order in council; 3 workers' advocates, Executive Officer to the Labour Relations Board, secretary to the Labour Relations Board, clerk steno 4, clerk steno 2, clerk typist 1.

Mr. Katzman: — On the workers' advocate, I believe you said this here, I understand that that gentleman is pretty well overloaded with work. Is there any consideration for additional assistance to him?

Mr. Snyder: — It's been filled recently, there are three workers' advocates.

Item 5 agreed.

Item 6

Mr. Katzman: — On page 42 of your annual report is where you refer to this vote and I am wondering if there is any consideration given to an apprenticeship course which would qualify people to assist in our major industry within the province, the industry of farming? As we all know, in Ontario they have started a program of apprenticeships for dairy workers and they are qualified and licensed through the government so that when a dairy man needs somebody he can find a qualified person who is being trained. I am wondering if there is any consideration within the department to open this area?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, over the past number of months a number of requests have been made to us as a result of the difficulty on occasions in finding people who are sufficiently skilled to operate farm equipment and work in some kind of specialized industry. We have been having a look at the matter and I'm not at all sure that it may be appropriate for purposes of a course to be offered in schools, vocational schools, STI in Moose Jaw or the Kelsey Institute or wherever but it is one that we are having a look at.

Mr. Katzman: — Of course, I realize we have the Vocag in Saskatoon and the school of agriculture, basically, and other programs, but my concern is that today's labour market for high school students and university students looking for employment there is a pretty rough market right now. One of the markets that is very short on workers is the farm industry because of the seasonal problems but we have no qualified people available. What I am suggesting is even a course that's available which would upgrade people for these types of positions who are basically looking for work, there would be a supply of them. Something, as I have suggested, along the Ontario system where you make arrangements with, let's say a dairy farmer - let's talk dairy for this one particular point - and where you would have approved dairy farms as training centres to get qualified workers in the industry. Is there any consideration being given for that type of a program. Basically like the old accountants course used to be to get a CA. You used to be able to work your way through and that's basically what I am suggesting.

Mr. Snyder: — Yes, well, there are a number of impediments I would expect in getting large numbers of people dedicated to the idea of being a farm worker, if you like. First of all, the question that you draw attention to, the problem with respect to the seasonal activities that are involved and the almost immediate expectation that after fall harvest there is a period of unemployment unless it's a mixed farming operation. That's one of the problems and, of course, that's accompanied also by a number of other features. The fact that in a large number of instances farmers have not chosen to provide the kind of working conditions that are to be found elsewhere. That is to say hours of work, annual vacation provisions. In a great number of instances, unless done voluntarily, farm help is not insured under The Workers' Compensation Act which represents another detriment I think in terms of encouraging people to get involved in that kind of industry regardless of whether they have an affinity for the soil or not. Sometimes I think the encouragement is the inducement to get involved in agriculture is fairly minimal unless they can own a piece of the action themselves and, accordingly, it is a continuing problem.

With respect to training programs I am not aware of anything that Continuing Education is doing, certainly nothing through our apprenticeship branch, except for the fact that at one of our vocational schools there is a course offered in maintenance and repair of heavy equipment and things of that nature that may have some spill-over

effect as far as the agricultural community is concerned.

Item 6 agreed.

Item 7 agreed.

Item 8

Miss L.G. Clifford (Wilkie): — Mr. Chairman, I have two brief questions. One is that you have decreased the people in this department and I would like to know if this is a change in priority. At a time when you were just becoming to make some progress, why are you not increasing the numbers in this department? Secondly, I would like you to give me the salary ranges for the people who do the investigations in the department; the number of investigators in each series and the job description for all these. I realize that the last part will take some time so you can give it to me at a later date.

Mr. Snyder: — We will pick that up for you and send it over to you if you like. There was one deletion, one research position was deleted and the slack was picked up by the research division of the department. So that one position was a research position and the additional work is covered off by the research division in the same building.

Miss Clifford: — Do you not feel that at this time you should be giving more priority and concern to investigation in this department and development of the department, because it is such a new area and you have done some good work in it and you should continue to do so?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, as I indicated to you the position that was deleted was not an investigative person; it was a research position. I am told that the research has been adequate and in general terms, the research component that we have within the department has been able to pick up whatever slack was left vacant when the one position was deleted from subvote 8.

Item 8 agreed.

Item 9

Mr. Katzman: — I think the minister and the director of occupational health realized my personal opinion on the occupational health.

I noticed this year, though, that you are under vote 9, 10, 11 and 12. I assume those four votes are all occupational health. Is there any reason why they are not put together, why they are separated the way they are here? Or is the safety division sort of not tied to occupation, vote 11?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, I suppose this is the manner in which the subvote is prepared. I think this is the manner in which the votes have been submitted on previous occasions. I don't believe it represents a new accounting procedure and I don't think there is anything unorthodox. Well, I am told that for purposes of neatness and efficiency it is broken down in this way in order to separate expenditures for a more careful analysis of it all, with the occupational health and safety. Basically the administration covered under 9 and subvote 10 is the subvote which covers the Occupational Health Officers, the medical director of Occupational Health and the safety services are separate and apart. This takes in the gas and boiler inspection and the fire prevention officers and

things of that nature.

So for ease of accounting and separation of expenditures it is regarded as being a more convenient way of submitting the subvote.

Mr. Katzman: — I seem to have mislaid a piece of paper. I was calculating that Occupational Health is basically a third of the vote here. I think it is considerably more in the financial portion. Would the minister have a rough idea? It looks to me probably 50 per cent or better of the labour vote. Am I correct on that or could one of your fellows maybe check it?

The reason I am asking and I think I should explain that, Mr. Minister, Occupational Health is new in Saskatchewan and they are doing an excellent job under Mr. Sass. I can't say the same under the former director, but Mr. Sass, in my opinion, is doing a much better job and deserves to be commended for it.

The member for Moose Jaw, who sits in the back row, I think is a little out of line. He is standing back there yelling, that is not what you said a little while ago. If he would like to tell me what I said a little while ago, against the Occupational Health Division of the Department of Labour, I will sit down and let him answer the question. The Occupational Health Division, under Mr. Sass, has done an excellent job and don't ever think that you are the only person in this House that appreciates the good work they have done. It is unfortunate that employers sometimes, in the past, have not been as co-operative and it has been sometimes that employees have not been as co-operative and have made the department's work and Mr. Sass' work a lot more functionable.

If the member for Moose Jaw, in the back row, would let the member for Moose Jaw, in the front row, handle this estimate we will be better off.

Mr. Snyder: — The figures indicate that about 55 per cent of the departmental estimates are devoted to the Occupational Health and Safety Branch, 54 per cent of the staff and about 55 per cent of the expenditures.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Minister, is the department now, basically, in your opinion, grown to its finish, have you most of the people in place that you need to do a sufficient job, or do you expect additional growth? Each year it has grown, since I have been in the House and I am asking now, do you figure your department has now got sufficient expertise, forgetting for one moment the new problem that you may or may not have depending on the uranium industry situation?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, I suppose there is never a department that feels that they are doing everything that they should do. I think the Occupational Health and Safety Branch is doing an excellent job with the kind of staff that we have available to us. Obviously, there are things that may happen in the immediate future that we can't anticipate in at this point in time. If, for example, we were in a position to assume some responsibilities of the federal government then, of course, this would represent an increase of staff. If we were, for example, to take over the inspection services for some organization such as the steel workers operation in a number of places, the people who are directly involved in grain handling have also been in touch, not only with us, but with the federal authorities to elicit our support and attempt to have us take over the policing and the administration of occupational Health and Safety and assume the responsibilities that I think are being done badly by the federal government.

Now, if that were to happen, and I can't suggest the whole question is entirely ruled out, then I assume that it would probably mean an expanded staff. In the meantime we are doing, I think, a much better job with many, many fewer people than the Department of Labour and the Occupational Health Division in the province of Alberta is doing, where they have, I understand, far more people on staff and I think are doing a far less effective job than we are doing here.

Mr. Katzman: — the minister made a comment about takeover. When you take over the responsibility, for example, if you do the grain industry, will you be getting a sum of money to cover the additional expenses from the federal government because you are doing a job on their behalf for them. Will they reimburse you?

Mr. Snyder: — There is no indication at the moment that the federal government is going to back away from their responsibility in areas which are defined under the Grain Act and the Atomic Energy Control Act and the other federal statutes that name this as their responsibility. There is no clear indication that that is even a remote possibility at this time, that it may happen at some time in the future. In the event that were to happen, I think we would take a pretty clear position with respect to a cost-sharing arrangement. Certainly if we were to assume some responsibilities that were formerly federal responsibilities we would be looking for some kind of funding and some financial assistance in order that we could perform that task properly.

Mr. Katzman: — The consideration that I am referring to is, during the hearings on the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry, there was some suggestion that your people do some work within the uranium industry on the occupational health area. Are you saying now that you are doing this for the betterment of the workers because our standards in the province of Saskatchewan are better enforced or better looked after? I would probably agree with the minister if that is his argument, but I am asking, are you receiving any assistance at all from that area while you were assisting the federal government recently?

Mr. Snyder: — First of all, in the construction stages during the period of time when construction is in the process of taking place, we have direct responsibility under our jurisdiction for occupational health and safety during the construction stages. We have, with the permission of the company, done examinations and issued correction orders in the uranium industry at Eldorado and elsewhere, because they have no inspectors. The Atomic Energy Commission have no inspectors at all, in terms of inspecting places where workers may be affected by radiation and other health or occupational hazards. So accordingly, we have offered our inspection services and we have not been reimbursed by the Atomic Energy Commission for any of the work that the department has done. It has been a free, gratis arrangement and those services have been provided by the department in the interests of the people who are working in those federal operations.

Mr. J.L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Chairman, dealing with Item 10, which I think encompasses Item 11 and Item 12 practically, my question is, a while back, less than two or three days ago, we saw in West Virginia where there 51 persons died because of the lack of inspection in the occupational health and safety at that time. We have also seen the situation here in Canada where a number of federal agencies or under the jurisdiction of the federal agencies and under their program, would like to be under the provincial Occupational Health and Safety, particularly here in the province

of Saskatchewan. I might say to the minister that the Director of your Occupational Health and Safety Branch at this time has developed a program in Saskatchewan which is recognized across Canada and North America, in fact now across the world, as one of the best programs that has ever been in existence in so far as any country is concerned. But my problem is this, while the hon. member for Rosthern did not attack the integrity or the character of our Director of Occupational Health and Safety in Saskatchewan, the leader of his party took over in his bureaucratic fashion, took over from the hon. member for Rosthern who was trying to conduct the labour estimates, and he did attack the character and he did assassinate the character of the Director of the Occupational Health and Safety here in Saskatchewan.

For one moment I would not say that the hon. member for Rosthern would bend to that low level, whatever we may call it in society, but his leader did and we have to accept the fact that if anybody then, according to the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, comes from outside the province of Saskatchewan, his character must be attacked and character assassination goes on in these estimates. My real question that I would like to know from the minister if I may, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not, in view of the great demand of those organizations all under the federal jurisdiction as far as Occupational Health and Safety is concerned, whether or not there is any ongoing consultation now with the federal authorities, to transfer some of the responsibility from the federal authorities to the provincial authorities, under the Occupational Health and Safety?

Mr. Snyder: — I think in answer to the hon. member's question it goes somewhat deeper than the communications and the verbal dialogue that we had with the federal authorities. The member will know that the British North America Act stakes out certain federal responsibilities and it requires some legislative changes, because for example, grain elevators are regarded I believe in the legislation as being for the general good of Canada and accordingly, fall under federal jurisdiction. Inter-provincial transportation, such as the railways is noted I believe in the British North America Act as a federal responsibility and accordingly we are not in a position without the co-operation of the federal authorities. First of all an amendment to the Grain Act, an amendment to the British North America Act which would make this possible and there is no indication at this time that the federal authorities are inclined to move in that direction.

Mr. Katzman: — Under Item 9, I think probably is the proper place to do it. I would like to suggest here that the members of the Assembly should maybe consider giving a vote of confidence to Mr. Sass who, in my opinion, is recognized as one of the top ones around and I don't know if he is blushing but I think it's key that we should recognize that even though his tenure with the government is short he is one of those who is an expert in his field that some of the others that were referred to, a group of four, are kept in very low seniority, have not. He started the program and straightened it out and I think he deserves credit for that.

Item 9 agreed.

Items 10 and 11 agreed.

Item 12

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Chairman, under Item 12, it should have maybe gone under Item 10. Could you tell me how many orders were written to correct Occupational Health standards, the problems that are developed in some industry that you had a problem with and you had to bring an order to correct it . . . just a number, if there were 60 or 200

this year?

Mr. Snyder: — It's not detailed quite in the way in which you ask your question but the number of inspections were 3,417, the number of violations noted 2,053, Occupational Health Committee visits, 1,007. It is rather difficult here because it doesn't necessarily indicate because there was a notation made that there were 2,837 violations that there were necessarily correction orders issued. If they were corrected on the spot it wouldn't necessitate, as I understand, the issuing of a correction order. If an inspection was conducted and a deficiency was located and repaired on the spot, it wouldn't necessitate a correction order issues, but there were 3,417 inspections and there were found to be 2,827 violations. Mr. Chairman, 2,827 violations were discovered in 3,417 inspections. Is that close enough?

Mr. Katzman: — You said there were 1,007 that came from occupational health committees. Of those, I am assuming that these are problems that couldn't be solved at an Occupational Health Committee level and, therefore, the government had to be involved. Is that correct?

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Chairman, 1,007 visits were visits that were conducted by Occupational Health Officers, two Occupational Health Committees. In an attempt to assist them, sometimes in the use of monitoring equipment which they may borrow from the Department of Labour and take into the work place to conduct tests whether it is heat stress tests or a test for other toxic material and things of that nature but the 1,007 visits to Occupational Health Committees is represented by that figure.

Mr. Katzman: — Just on that one point. Do you have any breakdown of how often you had to go in because a committee was locked and couldn't get an answer and your people had to come in and make the decision?

Mr. Snyder: — It would expedite the committee's work if we could dig that out. I believe the member was asking, how many problems were not resolved and had to be referred to the department. We will get that to you and send it over, if you like.

Item 12 agreed.

Department of Labour - Vote 20 agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 22 - An Act respecting Elementary and Secondary Education in Saskatchewan

Section 1

Mr. W.H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — Mr. Chairman, just to make a few remarks before we begin the clause by clause study on Bill 22. I would like to indicate personally and we also in the Liberal Party appreciate the fact that this consolidation of the legislation has taken place and recognize, when the final bill is passed, that there are a

good many things that are going to happen that probably are long overdue in education.

We think though, that over the period of time, a year and a half I suppose since we have had the introduction of the white paper and all of the various other pieces of proposed legislation, that some of the things that have happened have been sort of questionable. We indicated earlier that probably one of the difficulties and one of the reasons for all the turmoil we have had is that maybe we have been trying to do too much at one time. We all recognize there was this need to consolidate the legislation, to make it more comprehensible and some of the difficulties, those that we ventured into, a couple of areas that have been very controversial namely job security and also . . .

After collective bargaining, some time an apparent decision was made that the collective bargaining issue should be left for another day but the minute the decision was made to move into the area of job security of course, we have had a fantastic amount of turmoil within the educational circles within the province of Saskatchewan. It made one, who was looking at the situation, begin to wonder really what was going on over a period of time, particularly when it came to that issue of job security. It will be interesting to hear the minister's comments as to why we had so many changes in the government's position. I go back to the first piece of legislation, the old legislation, in which the year-end dismissals were only really subjected to a conciliation board. Then we had the White Paper on Education which indicated that probably that procedure should be changed and we should have binding awards for people with two or more years of service with the same board.

This is when the ministerial level of the government became involved in Bill 43 and for some reason in Bill 43 there became a position which indicated that year-end dismissals would be subjected to conciliation hearings and that awards would not be final. I guess this raised the expectations of the trustees in the province of Saskatchewan and alarmed those people who were members of the Teachers' Federation. Then we had a complete reversal and really it is remarkable how such a topic that has been controversial in Saskatchewan for so many years can have such differing positions by the government. Why, over a period of three or four months, we could have a complete reversal back to the situation which we had binding arbitration? Of course this then raised the expectations of the teachers. It will be interesting to see, when the minister finally tables his amendments in this legislature, whether or not again we have another change in the position of the government.

I hope that when the minister responds, he would just give us some indication as to why there could be such complete reversals of opinion within the government. What were these factors, the factors that made them change their mind? In one instance a conciliation hearing would be satisfactory for a year-end termination and then, just a few months later, to a situation in which there was binding arbitration. Just what was it that made the minister have this complete reversal of opinion? At least I guess we might say or conclude that possibly, when you are looking at it, maybe there was just a little bit of political pressure or was it by design, in the case of the government? Was it by design that possibly you thought that maybe the teachers of Saskatchewan might be getting a little offside as far as the support you have received in past years and maybe you should sort of bring them back in line and sort of . . . scare them just a wee bit? Then after the scare had taken place, you would be able to tempt them with the carrot and bring them back into line.

Many people that are sitting and observing this from the outside think that maybe all

these changes that we had, in one instance we raise the expectations and in the next instance we dash them, were by design. Certainly, it would almost seem to be that such a change in position is really remarkable and almost very hard to explain, but then we at least have that changing position with the government.

I just can't resist mentioning a few things about the Conservative Party in this. There are just a couple of things I would like one of the pages to distribute to some of the members around here. If not, we had all of the teachers in the province of Saskatchewan and trustees in the province of Saskatchewan. We received a letter from our friend from Saskatoon Sutherland in which he proceeded to outline the position of the Conservative Party. After many people read this I had comments, just beginning to wonder what that position really stated. It was certainly not relative to Bill 22, it seemed to be sort of a position, I guess you might sort of ride along, say nothing and, therefore of course, not be held accountable.

There was specific mention made in the letter from the member for Saskatoon, that he was going to circulate the letter to both trustees and teachers. You don't mind if I read the opening sentence of this. He says:

The education of our young people is far too important a topic to allow political polarization to take precedence over common sense solutions to the problems.

This was the opening sentence. In other word s- this is from the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Lane) - there was to be no sort of politics in the education system and that education was supposed to be above politics. This was the position of the education critic within the Conservative Party, their particular position. I ended up, also, with another paragraph that I would like to read, at the bottom.

I sincerely hope that the foregoing will assist you in an understanding of my reasons for opposing Bill 22. The same letter is being written to both teachers and trustees, not a separate letter to both organizations.

Mr. Chairman, last weekend I happened to go home to the office in Maple Creek and a rather interesting piece of mail had arrived in the office in Maple Creek. I would like to tell you about that piece of mail.

There was a letter addressed in the copy that I handed out to you, it was addressed to the secretary treasurer of the Maple Creek School Unit, a person whom I happen to work with in the Maple Creek School Unit. You will notice that the copy of that outside envelope had no identification on it; that there is no indication as to where the material inside the letter may have come from. But I assure you that when you opened up the letter, what you found out was the speech from the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) in which he indicated that his position was regarding, particularly, binding arbitration and many of the other things that affect Bill 22. There were five or six copies, if I remember correctly, circulated within this letter and I suppose we were supposed to pass it on to each member of the school trustees within our school jurisdiction. Anyhow we received this.

Now, anybody who has been in this legislature knows what the member for Rosetown-Elrose feels about the position of the Conservative Party, particularly the position advocated by Mr. Lane, the nothing position, I guess we might say, that Mr. Lane has adopted, and the very strong, strong position that Mr. Bailey has adopted.

Now the interesting part, if you take a look at these two envelopes, the very interesting part is that while the one is identifiable the other isn't. But who do you think might mail a copy of Mr. Bailey's speech to each of the school trustees in Saskatchewan? Incidentally, I imagine the first letter went to both trustees and teachers, but I presume the second one only went to trustees. At least I have been unable to find any teachers who received the second one.

Now, as I said that second envelope has no identification on it, but there is an interesting observation. When you mail letters here from the legislature they go down to the post office, down below, and each one of the postal machines in which they stamp our envelopes has a coding number. If you check closely on both of those envelopes you will notice that both of them ran through the same postal meter. Where is that postal meter located? It happens to be located down here in the basement of the Legislative Assembly. So there is an indication then that these five or six pieces of literature that came from Mr. Bailey must have been circulated here from the legislature within the province. O.K. Now, would you find that the New Democratic Party on the opposite side would be circulating Mr. Bailey's speech to all trustees within the province of Saskatchewan? Or would you expect that the Liberal Party, over here, would be circulating Mr. Bailey's speech to all of the boards in the province of Saskatchewan?

I think the answer is rather obvious, that that particular piece of literature must have come from the Conservative side of this House. Then the question is, now who sent that piece of literature from the Conservative part of this House? I suppose if we had a handwriting analyst and we could see that the one is hand addressed and we had some samples of who wrote and addressed the letter, we might be able to detect it. Is it something that came from the Conservative Party, or is it something that came from the member for Rosetown? I am not sure and I hate to say. But what is the purpose of sending this out? Is it to hoodwink the boards of Saskatchewan, the Conservatives trying to take two positions, or is it Mr. Bailey really feeling strong enough that his position within the Tory Party is really untenable, when it comes to education? And was it he who felt that he had an obligation that he had to go out to the school boards of Saskatchewan to tell his story?

Hon. Romanow: — Whose consent is it?

Mr. Stodalka: — The Attorney General says, whose consent is it? All I can tell the Attorney General, here in the legislature, is that the mail was sent through the same machine as far as the coding. Certainly it will be interesting to hear from the Tory Party as to what these two pieces of literature really are; which one is their official position, the position of Mr. Bailey or the position of Harold Lane? We'll find out when these members get up here. We will give them their opportunity so we'll wait and see here right now. It's rather an interesting session here, you might say. So we will find out a little later on when the members get up here and I think we have made our position clear to the member for Saskatoon Sutherland. Our position is that we have accepted the idea that the government of Saskatchewan is going to, (if the member will listen) . . .

An Hon. Member: — If you would shut up, Harold, you might be able to find out.

Mr. Stodalka: — I guess we have hit a pretty sensitive nerve tonight, haven't we? We have hit a pretty sensitive nerve. There is some indication, when the member for Regina South says that the member for Saskatoon Sutherland probably was not aware then

that this particular piece of literature was mailed to the school boards in Saskatchewan. Incidentally, I checked with a number of other boards to see whether that same letter was received by other school boards in Saskatchewan. I can assure you that the Maple Creek School Unit was not the only area that received that particular letter. There were other boards in Saskatchewan who have received that same particular document.

The question is though, was it mailed to teachers as the first one was? I really wonder if Mr. Bailey's comments were mailed to all of the teachers in the province of Saskatchewan?

An Hon. Member: — The Tories said they wouldn't play politics.

Mr. Stodalka: — That's the point. I remember reading an editorial in the Leader Post, and well documented I suppose by the people who write the editorials in the Leader Post, indicating that the Tory position was that there shouldn't be any politics in education - that there should not be any politics in education. Now, where have we seen more politics than this in education? First of all, the sending of a letter to all trustees and teachers within the province, outlining the position (the non-position) of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, and then this followed by a letter directed to the school boards in Saskatchewan, which takes the absolute contradictory position of the member for Rosetown.

It is too bad that we can't ask questions in this legislature from the members opposite as to who actually did mail that letter. But we had better get back to the ministers.

I indicated earlier and I would like the minister to comment and to tell this legislature why we had so many changes in the government's position when it came to binding arbitration. Why that merry-go-round? Why did you first raise the expectations of one group and then dash them and then raise them next ones and then dash them and get everybody in Saskatchewan all excited about education?

Hon. D.L. Faris (Minister of Education): — Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the member for his introductory remarks and ask him some questions because I think with further information, he will be quite satisfied as to the total process.

I think it is unfortunate that he suggests that the revision of this Education Act has taken place over something like 18 months or so. It has taken a great deal longer than that. I have here, a copy of the School Law Review Committee Report and that School Law Review Committee of course was set up in February, 1975. If the hon. member were to study that closely, some of the points that he has made in this discussion and earlier discussions would not have been made perhaps because I know one of the points was that, well, golly, if you fellows had just stuck to the consolidation of the legislation and not gone into these other areas, we wouldn't have had these problems.

But of course, in the terms of reference of the School Law Review Committee, some three years ago, the second point was 'to investigate and make recommendations to the Minister of Education regarding the consolidation and updating of existing statutes' and that second point brought us into looking at questions of updating legislation. One of these surely as the matter of for example, the area of job security. This very report based on studies made three years ago in recommendation number 33, said:

that in the case of dismissal, a teacher has the right of appeal to a tribunal whose award is binding.

At the very beginning of the process, trying to set out that principle - of course this leads us into the 'white paper' stage where, with the provincial Terminations Appeal Board, this was attempted, and of course there was a lot of discussion at that point. Quite frankly, there were a number of arguments raised by trustees throughout the province which we responded to.

They raised one particular point, and if you look at the SSTA brief in response to the 'white paper', they raised a point concerning the constitutionality of that proposal. Approximately one half of their brief dealt with that point of constitutionality. Another sort of concern that we heard, not so much through the SSTA brief but through local school boards and so on, was the question of whether it was a good idea to have a Terminations Appeal Board at the provincial level. They raised the question in regard to a lot of disputes, perhaps involving value systems of local communities and the question of whether there is such a thing as a provincial value system that should be superimposed on local communities.

Because of those two points, when it came to Bill 43, we quite frankly didn't have the answer as to how those concerns might be dealt with. You will recall that when Bill 43 was introduced we said that the process is ongoing and there were points raised in the early discussions that we wanted further feedback on. As a matter of fact following the tabling of Bill 43, myself and three of my senior officials visited some 95 per cent of the boards in the province and have represented teacher groups in the province to get involved more directly in a discussion of whatever those groups wanted to raise. Now we found, by working through the concerns and so on for Bill 22, what we thought was an answer to the constitutional question which was raised in regard to the white paper proposal and that is seen in section 222(2). This was a point which was raised by the SSTA, the question of constitutionality due to decisions which were made last fall in Ontario. The case which they raised, as an example of this, is in fact at present before the Supreme Court of Canada. So it is part of an ongoing process and was a reaction to things which were actually happening. So that's the reason we responded in that way.

The other point being responded to was this concern about the provincial board as it meets local value systems and so on. So we dropped down from the provincial level to the local level to try to see that in cases where disputes concerning value systems might in fact have a more meaningful local outlook. That's the rationale behind that movement.

Mr. Stodalka: — I would just like to indicate a little further that certainly the matter of conciliation hearings has been around a long time for year-end dismissals. It is not a question of any hearing going on in the Supreme Court of Canada involving Ontario. The question of binding arbitration coming on a little later has no connection with value systems and what's going on in some of the other areas. Certainly there must have been some other course that made the minister change his mind as to whether or not a system that has been operating for years and years in Saskatchewan was supposed to be replaced by another system with binding arbitration. So it is foolish to indicate that the system that we were operating on for many years is now going to be unconstitutional or improper and that you were, therefore, forced to go into a system in which we are going to have binding arbitration.

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Chairman, I am sorry but although the question of binding arbitration

during the school year has been a school law for some 40 or 50 years, the trustees' association in the province said, we have accepted that but if that's brought in for final year-end dismissal it will be straight into court on the constitutional issue. Now that may seem inconsistent but it is not an inconsistency on our part. That was a direct statement on their part of what their reaction would be to that kind of question and on the grounds of the constitutional question raised in Ontario. It is all in their brief and if the hon. member has that material he will be able to dig that up.

I do want, however, to make some comments on a point which was raised and I hope that when the member for the other opposition party rises that he won't neglect some answer as to this material which you have presented to the legislature now. I am sure it is an embarrassment to the member for Rosetown-Elrose . . . (interjection) . . . Oh, well, I understood that he didn't want to bring politics into this issue. I concede that the first material was sent out from Room 345 of the Legislative Building but as the hon. member has indicated, the second one doesn't say who sent it out and it is quite contradictory to the position taken by the member for Sutherland (Mr. Lane).

Mr. H.W. Lane (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Chairman, I believe that in terms of the general comments that we had on the act are on record and there is not much need to go into them in detail now. But I do want to go into detail in some things and one of them is this. The members to my right, and I'm going to regret this because they will soon go the route of all other Liberal administrations west of Nova Scotia, and that is, I believe, the most westerly provincial Liberal government that we have in Canada and, by the most recent Gallup polls after tonight, perhaps we can rid ourselves of that beast federally as well, so I shouldn't be wasting my time but I do want to answer something which he brought up. The member says, they are taking two different sides, the Conservatives are.

O.K., let's talk, for example, now on the business of binding arbitration. Our position in second reading was made clear. We said that with respect to binding arbitration as brought in Bill 22 as it was set up under the current legislation, has certain difficulties. We foresaw one difficulty, for example, the powers of the board are very broad. We also foresaw some difficulty in the fact that there was no right to appeal and this could be dangerous considering the broadness of the powers of the tribunal which would hear these matters. This could be very dangerous to both teachers and trustees in the advent that an adverse decision was taken. It is in *Hansard*; will you take the trouble to go and read it? I assume that you are a literate person. You are a product of this system and we would hope that you came through literate and we would ask you to go and read it now.

The point was, in that dissertation I had laid out frankly and clearly that even though there were these difficulties the teachers of Saskatchewan had an absolute right to have a hearing and that they had the right at the end of that point in time to have some teeth in a decision which was rendered. Therefore, we said that as the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, we saw every reason in the books why the teachers would come and ask for something along this line and we could see why the STF was arguing for this position. They had to have it.

Now, we accepted that fact. Now, compare that for a moment with what the member for Maple Creek who just spoke, said. Don't forget this is the member who is saying, we don't know what your position is. Now, just listen carefully for a minute and I intend to take my chair in a few minutes and I hope that the members over here will get up and state their position. I honestly hope to hear them state their position, because the

saddle sores are going to put them to a lot of pain.

Now, see what he says tonight and he continues in the same vein that he has been for some time. He says, 'I am going to be very interested to see what the minister does about this binding arbitration.' Then he carefully documents how the government has gone over here and gone over there, and then he repeats, 'I am going to be very interested to hear what the government has to say about this, in this position.'

We have yet to hear, and I am going to invite these folks, to my right, in the few remaining months that they have to sit in this legislature, to tell us what their position is, even on that one matter, binding arbitration.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall, and the press if they have an ounce of fairness left in them will recall that there were certain members over here that got up and said, Oh, we are all for the binding arbitration, the way it is proposed in Bill 22. We are all for it. Then there were other members who got up and said, Oh, we are all against binding arbitration. So you didn't know where the Liberals were. It is like the cups, you move them around and there is one Liberal under this one and one Liberal under this one. And then, Mr. Chairman, when it came time for a vote, what happened? Oh, then some of them who had spoken in this group and were pressing the others conveniently disappeared from the House. The record will show that. I invite all hon. members to take out the records and see how the speeches were rendered and then compare it with who was here for the vote and how they voted. Now, what kind of slippery, sleazy politics is this? I would expect it from your federal counterparts, but I would hope that you would learn something from the lesson that has been taught to you from provincial Liberals in every other province west of Nova Scotia, because your demise will be swifter and more clean than any of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I simply say that if anyone at this point in time does not know what our position is it because they are, in fact, playing politics and they don't care to learn what our position is.

There is one more item, Mr. Chairman, briefly, and I would like to make this general comment. We took exception because it is fundamental and goes to the heart of our policy. Now, members on that side of the House may not agree with us. They may think that we are absolutely wrong. Be that as it may it is our policy and we believe it; we believe it very firmly. We believe that people in local communities should have some right to control education, have some say over what happens in education, in municipal affairs and so forth.

Now, the minister pointed out, quite correctly, that certain matters in the new legislation had, in fact, taken on more decentralization. In fairness to the minister if you look back into history at the time that I was going through school, for example, it is as far back as I can obviously give a record of it. A small country school at that time when the inspectors as they were called then, came into the schools, they literally were the inspectors and talked about centralized authority, there were certain aspects of education that were extremely centralized. Another example that I might refer to is the departmental examinations; they came right out of Regina. Now granted, in certain ways you have moved away from that but then - this is the dangerous one and all we did was point it out because we believe very firmly that this is the kind of thing that should not be allowed to happen - we have this section in this act which gives the minister (it is unprecedented as far as I can tell) oh just a minute now, it has a precedent, Mr. Minister of Education, in this sense, before the rules of fair play and natural justice

in our legal system came about, then the Star Chamber in its wisdom could make the laws, interpret them and enforce them - that's the precedent - not certainly in a democratic system.

Now you smile and you smirk at that but if you don't need that kind of power then why do you take that kind of power unto yourself? First of all to interpret the legislation. Now surely that is the function as has been seen in our system, to be the function of the courts. That's the judiciary. They are to take the law and say, now let's see what the legislature meant by these particular sections. So first of all the minister takes it upon himself, the minister takes it upon himself to be able to interpret any section in any way which he deems fit. Then he can, if he deems the act to be inadequate, add to the legislation. Or if he deems it, in his opinion, Mr. Chairman, to be inappropriate, he can detract from the legislation. Now it may very well be that certain segments involved in education, Mr. Minister, believe at the current time that you represent their interests. I don't believe that the kind of polarization which happened a couple of years ago when I was involved in the teaching profession. I don't think that kind of thing has happened this time, too. I hope it hasn't and certainly we have not attempted in any way, to contribute to that polarization and I am not taking the position that any other parties have. But I hope we stay away from that because that was bad for education.

But, if armed with that kind of power, a minister was elected from a different party and that particular group did not like them, they could find that that power was very devastating to their membership, be it either the trustees or the teachers because a Minister of Education armed with that kind of power is a dangerous person in that society. Now we would simply ask - and then there was a catchall at the end of that, Mr. Chairman, saying he could just jolly well do anything he wanted, the Minister of Education. Now, we believe that that is wrong and that is a firmly held conviction on our part. You can attack us on the basis of why we are wrong in terms of principle and show us why we are wrong and we are prepared to listen to you, Mr. Minister, but until we hear some good reasons, we think it is wrong.

Mr. Minister, I have heard you indicate or indications from your department, either by yourself or by people from your department, well the minister simply wouldn't exercise the kind of powers that he has available to him under this act and that we, in the Conservative Party, are painting a very black scenario which would simply never happen. Well if it would never happen, why call that power unto yourself in the first place? You don't need it and if you don't need it, why put it there? And why not ask for the review of legislation to take place in the Legislative Assembly in the normal course of events?

Now, I have one other matter that I wish to deal with to lead into this particular portion of the passage of the Education Bill but before I do, I wish once again, to call to the attention of all hon. members and of members of the press corps and of the members to my right that they have yet to take a party position. They seem to be split all over on this binding arbitration thing and it doesn't do. You won't get by to say I'm interested to see what the minister will do now. Your curiosity doesn't concern us. Your position concerns us. Well, no, I'm wrong. Your position doesn't concern anyone but I would like to hear your position because we haven't heard it yet.

Mr. Chairman, there was one other large area of concern and I intend to move a motion very quickly for the members of this House to consider and that was this. Having had a background of experience as a teacher I might tend sometimes to view things as a

teacher. I said before and I say it again that I hope this matter of education can be viewed by all parties in as non-partisan a fashion as possible. I had indicated one particular matter that was of concern to us in this Conservative Party and it was that we wished to see for the teachers of Saskatchewan the fullest kind of professional status that was possible. Now the minister in return after he replied to that matter the other day when I spoke on it in the House, came back and started very quickly to twist that - the old NDP twist - to say that I was attacking teachers for not being professional. I had thought that the Minister of Education considering his background would rise above that kind of thing and that kind of misrepresentation. Now what I did say was that I feel that teachers do have and do exhibit in the province of Saskatchewan - I worked with many of them, many of them are my friends - a professional attitude toward their work but that doesn't mean for a second that there isn't room for improvement.

Now, we don't intend, in terms of the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan to push anything down anyone's throat and, therefore, if the teachers didn't want to have us raise this matter we would simply walk away from it. But I invite the Minister of Education to look into the policy hand book of the STF, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, and I invite him to read the section in which the teachers have for several years now, I don't know how long, there is a gentleman here who may be able to inform you on that later, have been asking for a full professional status and in particular that governments and legislators in this province look to the matter of certification of teachers. Now, it may work; it may not. Teachers have gone on record in their policy hand book as asking for it and believe me I have had a number of phone calls and a number of letters from teachers indicating that they are quite sincerely happy about the stand I am taking. I have had a few on the other side, too, quite frankly.

Now, I am going to call on the minister and, if he is a fair man, I think that he will hear my case and give me some answers either one way or the other and tell me why he would accept this resolution or go against it. I am going to call on him to establish an all-party committee and I am also going to invite the minister in his attempt to cut across party lines to invite the interested groups. Naturally the STF would be the foremost in that respect because this is going to be something which is going to affect their membership very directly. Now I would like them, Mr. Chairman, to have that committee, if the minister will co-operate in this regard, hold hearings and examine this whole area of full professional status and in particular the matter of certification. Doctors have it; lawyers have it; why not teachers? Because to say that teachers shouldn't have the right to certify their own members is to say that they are less professional than doctors and lawyers. I don't think that you will go out in public, Mr. Minister, for a minute and say to the people of Saskatchewan that you believe that teachers are less professional than doctors and lawyers. They are every bit as professional. Give them a chance at full professional status and they will jump at it and they will accept certification. Then we will have a situation where the professional standards are controlled from the inside and whereby the teachers of Saskatchewan will look to their own and where it reflects on every teacher if there is a bad teacher in the lot and they will darn well want to have the highest standards because a bad teacher next to them reflects on their own professional image in the community.

I, therefore, move seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey):

That this committee urge the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately establish an all-party committee to work with representatives of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and other interested groups, in reviewing the possibility of gaining full professional status for Saskatchewan

teachers, and thereafter recommend to this Assembly what steps, if any, should be taken.

Mr. Chairman, I would like once again, to invite the member to my right who spoke, to for once have the guts to get up in this House, tell us what their stand is on just one issue and that is the matter of binding arbitration. Tell us where their party stands.

Hon. R. J. Romanow (Attorney General): — Well, you're looking at the motion. I wonder if I may beg the good will of the Minister of Education, to say a few words on this bill because quite frankly, Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. I have to remind the hon. member that until I have put the motion, I cannot allow any more speaking.

Debate continues on the motion.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two in the hope that I get some clarification for myself in any event, as to what the explanation is by the Progressive Conservative party, with respect to apparently two different positions being sent to two different groups involved in education.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not know about this until tonight obviously. I would like to ask the hon. member who tabled these few envelopes, to table if he will, the documentation that was in those envelopes, at least photocopies of the envelopes so that we can compare them as well.

But I want to, Mr. Chairman, just briefly state again, what appears to be the facts on the face of the record here. First of all as I understand the hon. member, one envelope at the top, coming out of Room 345 with a meter postage number was signed by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland which purported to articulate opposition with respect to Bill 22, which contents of that first letter were sent only to the teaching profession . . . They were sent to everybody. The second letter without an address, without a return address, without a covering letter - or is there a covering letter? Without a covering letter, mailed over the same postage meter which postage meter number is the same as Room 345, namely the PC caucus, was apparently mailed to the trustees only of the province of Saskatchewan . . . It was not mailed to the trustees of Saskatchewan? Well, Mr. Chairman, then we will get the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose, since it is his speech, presumably he consented to the mail out of the documents and the contents in the bottom envelope, to tell this House to whom this documentation was sent, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps he can then clarify for me, that particular aspect.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I would ask that the member for Saskatoon Riversdale confine his remarks as close as possible to this motion now, and . . .

Mr. Romanow: — No, sir . . .

Mr. Chairman: — No. The motion is before us now. Then you can return to the other. That is my ruling and I think that we have to confine it to the motion now that is before the House. After the motion is disposed of there is nothing to stop any of you from returning to Item 1 again.

Mr. Romanow: — On a point of order, with all due respect, how can that apply if the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland gets up and makes all kinds of speeches with

respect to the purported envelopes and then by your ruling, makes a motion which is confining? Surely that can't apply on subvote 1. Surely that can't apply, and in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it never has applied.

Mr. Chairman: — If I might just state again to the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, that debate is not limited . . . Order, please. The debate is not limited and I am not stopping anyone from returning to that debate again after this motion is dealt with. The motion is now before the House and I would ask him to please confine his remarks as close as possible to the present motion. Then we can return to Item 1.

An Hon. Member: — This has never been the case in committee . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. Is this debating the ruling or is it carrying on with the motion?

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If this is your ruling that we must debate this motion, I for one will agree to it. I suggest to you in all honesty that the Attorney General made his speech and I think it puts me in a very awkward position of not being able to answer the charges in which he levied at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman: — Again, if I could remind the member for Rosetown-Elrose . . . Order! I was speaking at the time and I would like to state to the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose that, again, he can enter into the debate on Item 1 once this motion is disposed of. There is nothing to stop any of them from that.

Order, please! I might say, in all sincerity, you can't speak to my ruling and the point of order is not my point of order. I would have to acknowledge the new point of order.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. I would like to ask the Attorney General who just rose in his place, and I would like to ask your ruling on this. If he is questioning the right of individual MLAs, in this Assembly, to send out letters to anyone that they desire?

Mr. Chairman: — The question before the House is the motion.

Mr. G.H. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Chairman, the point that I wanted to raise was that it seemed . . . of Bill 22, which is a very broad topic and which brought forward a rather innocuous statement from the member to my left. The Attorney General has indicated an interest to speak to the motion and to the general topic that is drawn in terms of education and it seems to me that it is in order for that to continue.

Mr. Chairman: — Order! I have made my ruling and, again, if you want to challenge that ruling, that is fine.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS - 7

Collver
Bailey
Ham

Berntson
Lane (Sa-Su)

Wipf
Katzman

NAYS - 28

Blakeney
Thibault
Bowerman
Romanow
Messer
Byers
Lange
Kowalchuk
Matsalla
MacMurphy

Mostoway
Banda
Whelan
Kaeding
McNeill
MacAuley
Feschuk
Faris
Rolfes

Tchorzewski
Shillington
Vickar
Skoberg
Nelson (Yktn)
Allen
Koskie
Johnson
Lusney

Mr. G.H. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview): — . . . to the bill to the . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Will the member for . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . It is who I recognize . . . State your point of order.

Mr. Collver: — My point of order is quite simply this. Before this motion, when the member for Rosetown-Elrose stood in his place and asked if he was to speak to the motion, you made him sit down and recalled the question. The member for Rosetown-Elrose had the floor at that time; he rose at the same time this time to take the floor and I think that it is incumbent upon you to recognize the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

Mr. Chairman: — Order! Order, please. When this started, the member that was on his feet was the hon. member for Saskatoon Riversdale and that is who I called to order. That was the gentleman I called to order at that time and now I acknowledge the member for Saskatoon Eastview.

Mr. Penner: — Mr. Chairman, I cease to be amazed at how absolutely incredulous this group to my left really is when it comes to its position with regard to education. You know, Mr. Chairman, we had the education critic stand up a moment ago and put forward a motion that had to do with the certification of Saskatchewan teachers and the professional status of that group and expect that by having people take some kind of simplistic point of view, with regard to something as important as the professionalism of Saskatchewan teachers, was going to solve some problems. Now, Mr. Chairman, it was childish, silly, ridiculous, stupid. There are few positions that could be taken with regard to education and Bill 22 that are as absolutely irrelevant, misconceived, than the position put forward by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane). And if he thinks that Saskatchewan teachers are going to be hoodwinked into thinking that somehow their vote a moment ago makes them the saviours of Saskatchewan teachers, then he misunderstands the intelligence of Saskatchewan teachers, because I expect that the position of Saskatchewan teachers is going to be filled with the same kind of humour and disgust as they had when they read the position of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland when he circulated the letter in the first place. There have been few documents related to Bill 22, few statements related to Bill 22, that received

laughter from teachers in Saskatchewan as did the statement made by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland when he distributed that letter.

That letter and the position of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, the so-called education critic of the Tory Party, had nothing in it, absolutely nothing in it. The strange thing, Mr. Chairman, is that when the person in their caucus who knows something about education circulates out of this same building, unbeknownst to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland or anybody else in their caucus apparently, a statement that was printed in the *Leader Post*, which was a reasonable reflection of what he said in the House and which had the guts to take a position, that they become a little upset and a little concerned that maybe the so-called thin straggling that the member talked about a moment ago, that they tried so hard to maintain, is in fact upset.

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — Tell us your position.

Mr. Penner: — You know, Mr. Chairman, if the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland would spend a little bit of time in this House, and if he would care to read *Hansard* he would know full well what the position of the Liberal Party is. He would know full well that in addition to the Liberal Party taking an official position with regard to certain sections of the bill, some of us had some individual positions that we made very clearly known with regard to certain sections of the bill. He would know full well, for example, that I have indicated for a long while that I am opposed to compulsory binding arbitration as an individual. He would know full well that my seatmate stood in his place and said he supported compulsory binding arbitration. He would know full well that the amendments that we placed before the Assembly, in second reading, and the amendments that have been submitted to the Clerk, indicated that we recognize that compulsory binding arbitration is going to be a fact of life in Saskatchewan.

Now the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, Mr. Chairman, obviously can't take the heat and he ought to do as Roosevelt suggested and get out of the kitchen. I am glad to see that he has made his exit, because when it comes to education the contribution that that member makes is better outside and unseen than it could possibly be sitting in his place in this Assembly. Our position with regard to compulsory binding arbitration, recognizing that it is going to take place, was that first of all the scope of the binding arbitration board needed to be narrowed, that there needed to be a change to clause (d) of the section that made the award in addition to either a dismissal or a retention and that there needed to be a change in the last section which allowed appeal to the courts. I am pleased to see when I look at the amendments that have been put forward by the minister that at least some of those sections have been included. I confess at this time not to have had enough time to take a look at all of it in that area and look at all of the implications but at least some of them are there and we are glad to see it. It is an indication that in fact the Liberal Party does have a position and stated it very clearly. It is known throughout and it is a good deal different from the position taken by the education critic of the Tory Party when he spent one-half hour when he debated Bill 22 in second reading saying, in effect, it's a sloppy bill and trying to hang his hat on that phrase, 'it's a sloppy bill'.

We indicated in second reading and we are pleased to see in the amendments that the matter of the qualifications of trustees has been broadened and that there is going to be a parallel relationship between the factors related to the RMs and education. We think that's good and we are glad to see again that the minister has picked up on a suggestion that we made.

We know that the area with respect to teaching diligently and faithfully has been included in the amendments and we are pleased about that. As I have indicated before, the matter about the limiting of the power of the arbitration board and the Court of Queen's Bench have also been included and we are pleased about that.

Mr. Chairman, it is our view as we indicated in second reading, that the majority of this bill is good, the majority of this bill can go through pretty well untouched. There are going to be sections that sometime down the road are going to be requiring further looks. There is not very much to be gained by spending very much time now on more than a half dozen or eight sections in this bill. We propose to move along that line and get at it.

Mr. Bailey: — I have in my hand at the present time the address of the hon. Minister of Education which he delivered to this House to conclude second reading. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, at that particular time that is now with the amendments. I agree with the amendments that the minister has raised but that is now the fourth position which the government opposite has related to this bill. It is now the fourth position. The members to my right can talk about the difference of opinion in their caucus and they have stated it quite well.

We have had three different Ministers of Education since 19975. We have had four different, distinct positions. I am very please, very pleased to see the Minister of Education at the present time, in the delivery of his speech on April 24, finally come up with a position.

I want to tell the Attorney General about his concern of what happened to be in that envelope. You know, Mr. Attorney General, I gave an address in this House, it was on a Wednesday, and I don't know what the circulation of the Leader Post is, but they printed an article on my address at that particular time. It came out in the Leader Post on Thursday and you stood in this House and cried your eyes out on Friday because you didn't get any mention. This is the particular document that I sent to certain school boards and certain teachers and certain people around this province. I will tell you why it had the same number. I took it home on Friday and with the secretarial help I had I designated people. If the Attorney General is making a statement to this House, that it is wrong for an individual member of this House to do so, I would like to hear him make a response to that when his opportunity comes. That is what happened and I am not ashamed of what happened. The caucus knew what happened and somebody is trying to make a big issue out of nothing.

You know about a government being mixed up; you talk about people being mixed up. The hon. member of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy) - I don't know who wrote this report up for him, but he circulated it. It went to every weekly newspaper in Saskatchewan. It says: — 'Gordon MacMurchy Comments on Bill 22.' But the one paragraph, the closing paragraph, was a deliberate deception going out to the news media in this province. If you go back to that particular news release you will see this in the bottom paragraph - that we have to get this bill in line with other provinces, and they were referring to the arbitration issue. Mr. Minister, you knew it, that article had to go out over your desk. There is no way that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is going to comment on Bill 22, I am quite sure, without your knowledge. Surely you would not let a minister from another department send out - as you people are the best oil machine when it comes to advertising of anyone in North America, I am sure. The hon. member sent out that under his name, as a former Minister of Education. He purported in that

particular statement that in the whole idea of teacher tenure and job security that this bill would get things in line with the other provinces.

I say to the government opposite that that was a very deceptive piece of journalism. The minister knows, the former minister knows and the former, former minister knows, that when you are talking and making innuendoes in your press release to the people of Saskatchewan, you were, in fact, being deceptive.

Let's take the case in Alberta, just to clear up this point. I am not saying that Alberta is correct in this, but there was the fact that you attempted to prove in your letter that was sent to the weeklies that by having binding arbitration in Saskatchewan you would be getting more or less in line with the other provinces. You know that to be wrong because in the case of Alberta, a board of reference consists of a district court judge and he is selected by the minister. Now listen carefully. What does that judge do? The judge holds a hearing to determine a very simple question. Now what is that question? Whether or not the school board, in effecting the termination acted reasonably. The judge and the board of hearing in Alberta does not do anything else and yet your statement that went out under your name, sir, indicated that this bill was getting in line with the other provinces.

Now, Mr. Minister, that is a gross deceit. It is deceiving the Saskatchewan people and you knew it . . . Just a moment now. The judge in the Alberta case does not attempt to substitute one way for the school board evaluation. I have to make that point clear because you deliberately did not make it clear to the people of Saskatchewan. You deliberately did not make it clear.

Now, Mr. Minister, I want to come back to your address. There is nothing wrong with the government changing its position - a complete 180 degrees from Bill 43 to Bill 22. There is nothing wrong with that at all. And there is nothing wrong with the nine amendments, I believe it is, that you have proposed. The reason why you have proposed these amendments is very clear. It is because of pressures brought from within this House and from without this House. It is well recognized that that is why the amendments are there. So we find with the government that they have made some very, very distinct changes and I think that you have acted reasonably in making these changes.

Let's get back to some of the debate in this House. Let's get back to some of the debate in this House. In speaking to Bill 22, I very clearly stated that first of all, under the situation I, as an individual, was not in agreement with binding arbitration. I want to tell the minister a few reasons why and I want him to listen very carefully.

You will find that there are those who will argue and say that the boards and the principal and the superintendent could well make a mistake and that is fair game. That is a fair comment. On the other hand, the three tribunals could equally be in a position of making a mistake. There is no question about that. The fundamental step that you took, in Bill 22, which distinguished Bill 22 from the past, was that the minister got his hands out of appointing the chairman. That is the fundamental difference. The former minister, the minister now of Municipal Affairs, knows full well that within a very few months after he was elected in 1975 and took the Education portfolio, he had one of the most distasteful cases on his hands that the province had ever seen. He well remembers that case. It wouldn't have mattered, at that particular time, to the hon. member what had happened because he had appointed the chairman. That is why Bill 22 automatically was a big improvement over the past record of the Board of

Reference. And to that, we had agreed. But for any group of people, Mr. Minister, whether it be government people, whether it be trustees or teachers, that said, look, this quasi-judicial body for some way is sanctimonious and we will defranchise these people. We will tell to the boards that they have lost the right of ordinary citizens. We will say to the teacher who could well be wrong, that he or she has lost her citizenship rights too and, therefore, would have no appeal to the press.

Let me ask you this question. You very wisely, you very wisely made changes to that binding arbitration. I am glad to see that you have. The reason that you have is that it got to you and got to your colleagues over there, that binding arbitration in this particular case, took away the citizenship rights of an individual person, who had no recourse to the courts. You could take a teacher and by a board or tribunal could literally destroy that person forever.

The Liberal opposition, indeed, rose with another point and that was to limit the area and the scope of investigations. Again, you have listened to those recommendations.

I want to get back to the Attorney General. You know, Mr. Attorney General, I didn't see any news release of that: — I remember you speaking on a Friday and you were complaining bitterly and you were pleading with the press to get some press. Just complaining, all right. Later that night I happened to turn on QC 8 and here was the Hon. Attorney General complaining again, about not getting any press.

The reason why the minister was complaining about that is simply that members in this legislature and outside of this legislature have somehow softened the hearts of the government members in relationship to Bill 22. Now you will never admit that. No, you will never admit that the Liberal opposition amendments meant anything. You will never admit . . . (interjections) . . . O.K., let's see what happens. Your government wrote Bill 43. Your same government wrote Bill 22 - 180 degrees opposite. Nothing can be more controversial than the government opposite. Then the minister stands in a very polite way and makes amendments. Mr. Attorney General don't talk about the different stands you take. You people have not gone 180 degrees since 1975, you've gone 360 degrees since 1975 and around and round and finally, Mr. Attorney General, you've got yourselves a Minister of Education who has got it all together, finally. It took a little bit of time but you have finally got it all together.

Now, Mr. Minister, getting back to Bill 22 and somehow I have something to say along the line of what my colleague said from Saskatoon . . . (interjection) . . . Well, we have what we have here in the minister's address and I've had some time to take a look at it. What we have here are nine promised amendments and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that before we get through Bill 22 we will probably end up with a couple more amendments. I think these are amendments which the government will accept.

I want to point out and make it very clear to this legislature, that the government played around with Bill 43 and Bill 22 for one purpose and one purpose only. The statement that went out by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy) went out for one purpose and one purpose only. It seems very strange, indeed, that because I had sent out to some people a report from the Leader Post that somehow I was violating some rules or procedures of this House . . . (interjection) . . . a very, very dangerous charge, Mr. Attorney General. Oh yes, you left the innuendoes that somehow something wasn't above board. These people over here to the right tried to make

something out of the differences and they had their differences stated. I stated my case as to how I felt about Bill 22 in its present form. Amendments have been made to the bill to the effect that it won't be binding; it's subject to appeal, which we support and which I support. But somehow it isn't just quite right. Somehow it isn't quite right for the member for Rosetown-Elrose to speak in the House and state his own mind and that's exactly what I did. I want to tell the Minister of Education and I think he will be glad to hear this. Mr. Minister, I think that in talking with a number of school boards (I had a meeting with my own board on Monday and talked to several of other boards since.) They were interested in what the nature of these amendments were and I think what you are going to find, Mr. Minister, and I don't think we will have to spend that much time on Bill 22 going through the amendments. I think you are going to find general agreement among the teachers and the trustees in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now I want to say this to you, Mr. Minister. I know that the government opposite, as I said this afternoon in the House in regards to a resolution which I moved, it would not matter how you worded it, the government is going to change the resolution anyway. I know that the minister is never going to give any credit to the opposition, that it was the government only, but I think it has to be very clear to the press - I think it has to be very clear to the press.

Number one - the day the trustees assembled here (I believe it was on a Tuesday) I think that indicated something, Mr. Minister. I believe it indicated something to the people of the province. First of all, that you were dealing with a brand new breed of local officials, who are extremely concerned. I would have never believed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, it's all right. I would have never believed had I not seen it.

The second thing is, I think that there was a not genuine concern from across the province that it had to have an effect upon the minister. I like to, when the minister responds, I like to have him say that the thousands of names on the petitions that came to you, did not have an effect on the way in which you redrafted the proposals of Bill 22. You stand and say, you stand and say that the parent's signatures (and you have received hundreds of them, I know I did), you stand and say that work that they did at the local level, in drafting up all those petitions and signing all of the names, did not have some bearing on Bill 22. You know, in one community alone there was about 90 per cent of the eligible signatures, were on that one petition. So I think it has been healthy. I think there has been a lot of people involved in this. I think that there is no longer the polarization. I don't believe it is there. I think it is a healthy state to be in. I commend the minister for putting the amendments in which are due and I am sure that Bill 22 is not going to cause the amount of confusion in the province that your Bill 43 (which died on the order paper) would have and I think that the minister would agree to that.

I will be speaking to the various parts of the bill as well as some questions concerning local governments and local school boards. I think the minister is aware of some of my concerns there. Maybe I will be the only member on this side of the House that has some concerns about local boards. I am not talking about unit boards. Local boards as they exist in the schools are very, very important to me. With that, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Attorney General is satisfied with the nature of the letter that went out and that everything is above board and quite legal and that you have no reason to doubt the author of it. I would like also to tell the Attorney General that if he wants to complain again about not getting the press that he desires on Bill 22, perhaps what he should do is zero in on some item on Bill 22 and the press will pick it up. I am quite sure they will.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased . . . I beg your pardon? Well, the member for Regina Rosemont . . . I at least stand up and speak my mind in this House. I don't, on two particular occasions as the member did, stand up and raise an issue about a phoney little thing about a picture in the House - don't talk about me being gutless. Of all the gutless backbenchers, you have lowered yourself lower than any member of this House ever lowered themselves.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. I think we are straying away a little bit from Item 1.

Mr. Bailey: — I will be talking more on Bill 22 and I would like to call it 10:00 o'clock.

An Hon. Member: — I should say, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Collver: — A point of order.

Mr. Chairman: — State your point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: — He is just stalling for time.

Mr. Collver: — I wonder if it might be possible to call it 10:00 o'clock? Would that be possible?

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Chairman, it is very touching for me not to have the opportunity of speaking. That is what you call closure, Mr. Chairman, but I do want to say just a few words.

I want to say that this is the first time that I can recall that any government in the last 25 years, ours or theirs, has made a major reconstruction of a bill because of the opposition and because of the trustees and the public of Saskatchewan. And, perhaps, we may have to give a compliment to the Minister of Education for listening with an open ear and at least a responsible opposition that made a very valid contribution in this bill.

I want to say that . . .

Mr. Chairman: — It has been brought to my attention that it is now 10:00 o'clock.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:04 o'clock p.m.